Serial No.	*Date of receipt.*	*From whom.*
15	22-3-1916	Mr. Uthup Chacko and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Pampakkuda.
16	22-3-1916	Mr. P. B. Vincent and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Aryad.
17	22-3-1916	Mr. Kuruvila Chummaru and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Kyppizhay proverthy.
18	22-3-1916	Mr. Varkky Cheriya and others, Syrian Christians.
19	22-3-1916	Mr. Thomman Korula and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Pallam.
20	22-3-1916	The Rev. Father Easo Kathanar and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Omallur.
21	22-3-1916	The Rev. Father Abraham Kathanar and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Thodupuzha taluk.
22	22-3-1916	Mr. Pothan Ulahannan and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Manchatikkaray.
23	22-3-1916	Mr. Kunjavira Dastyan and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Mararikulam.
24	22-3-1916	The Rev. Father Mathews Kathanar and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Vellikulam.
25	22-3-1916	Mr. Chandy Chandy and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Kumarakom.
26	22-3-1916	Mr. Varkky Itty and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Puthuppally.
27	22-3-1916	Mr. Cheriyithu Devasaya and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Thodupuzha.
28	22-3-1916	Mr. Kochitty Abraham and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Kottayam.
29	22-3-1916	The Rev. Father Kuriyakose Kathanar and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Pazhoor.
30	22-3-1916	The Rev. Father Mathoo Kathanar and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Vaikom taluk.
31	22-3-1916	The Rev. Father Zakkeria Kathanar and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Kartigappalli.
32	9-6-1916	The Rev. Father P. V. Zakkeria Kathanar and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Pallippaud, Kartigappalli.
33	30-6-1916	Do.
34	26-7-1916	The Rev. Father Abraham Kathanar Ouseph Kathanar and others, Syrian Christian inhabitants of Chengannur.
35	Telegram 25-9-1916	Catholic Syrians of Changanacherry.
36	27-10-1916	The Rt. Rev. Mar A. Chulaparambil, Vicar Apostolic of Kottayam.
37	21-11-1916	The Rt. Rev. C. H. Gill, Bishop of Travancore and Cochin, Kottayam.

THE CIVIL COURTS REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Subba Aiyar, in introducing a Bill to amend the Civil Courts Regulation, II of 1084, so as to make provision for raising the jurisdiction of particular Munsiffs up to Rs. (5,000), said as follows:—

"I beg to introduce a Bill to amend the Civil Courts Regulation. The purpose of the amendment has been duly stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It has been represented to the Government that the estate-owners in Devicolam are put to very serious difficulty and inconvenience in as much as they have to go a very long distance to Parur to file suits above the value of Rs. (2,000). To remedy this, it is thought expedient to raise the jurisdiction of the Devicolam Munsiff to Rs. (5,000). Though the amendment is worded generally, I do not think that it is the object of the Government to invest any other Munsiff with jurisdiction up to Rs. (5,000). With these observations, I beg to move that the principle of the Bill be affirmed".

Seconded by Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar.

Mr. Velu Pillai, in opposing the principle of the Bill, said as follows:—

"While I do not propose to question the propriety of inserting a provision in the Civil Courts Regulation to enable the Government to invest the Munsiff at Devicolam with increased Jurisdiction, I must admit my inability to see eye to eye with the Mover in the amendment proposed by him. The Statement of Objects and Reasons refers to the difficulties of suitors in Devicolam which is 90 miles from the District Court at Parur, the principal Court of original jurisdiction in the District. The Government have always been anxious to render assistance to the development of the Planting District on the hills. If that was done at a time when the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

revenues of the State had no claim on the profits of the planting industry, it is still more legitimate and proper to render the planters some assistance at a time when the State gets a portion of the duty on tea exported from Travancore. My main object then is to point out that the wording of the Bill is not justified by the reasons alleged in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. Here is a case of a general authorisation to cover the circumstances of a particular case, and what is worse, it is based on an incorrect principle. Let us authorise the Munsiff of Devicolam to try suits of the value of Rs. (5,000), if that course be indispensable. But, a general clause imported into the Civil Courts Regulation will offer temptations to several people, and among them, Members of the Popular Assembly, to suggest that the benefit of the clause may be extended to other localities as well. Considerations of prestige and convenience will induce the support of other agencies, and the Government may find themselves face to face with a volume of public opinion in its favour. It is a supreme matter of policy that laid down the rule that Munsiffs should not have jurisdiction to try suits of the value of more than Rs. (2,000). Bigger suits involve larger interests and require that they should be tried by officers of larger experience. I am therefore for confining the exception to Devicolam.

The amendment is defective even as regards Devicolam; for the Munsiff of that place is generally an officer of lower grade, comparatively new to the work. Considering the extended powers which he is to be invested with, it is necessary that such Munsiff should be the first in point of efficiency and seniority, whose next promotion is a Judgeship in the District Court. I would propose that the designation of such officer be changed into "Sub-Judge" from that of "Munsiff". If this is done, he could be empowered to try suits of the value of more than Rs. (5,000), which, under the suggested arrangement, have still to be tried by the District Judge at Parur, who holds his Court 90 miles away. If we are to help the people of Devicolam, let us give them all the help they require."

Mr Subba Aiyar said in reply as follows:—

"In the first place, with regard to the question of the general power that has been taken, I would say that it is necessary for the reason that we do not know whether the Devicolam Munsiff's Court will be at Devicolam or it will be shifted anywhere else. There is the safeguard that a recommendation has to proceed from the High Court. Only the particular officer that is recommended by the High Court will be invested with jurisdiction up to Rs. (5,000). It is said that it will be better to designate the Munsiff of Devicolam as a Sub-Judge. I fear there are difficulties which Mr. Velu Pillai has not taken into account. In the first place, irrespective of the value of the suits, whether it is Rs. 200 or Rs. 300, all appeals from the decisions passed by such an officer will have to come to the High Court. Secondly, a Munsiff has Small Cause jurisdiction up to Rs. 100. Ordinarily, the District Judges, as Sub-Judges, have no Small Cause jurisdiction. They have got it in particular classes of suits, namely, under the Jenmi and Kudiyan Regulation for a particular purpose. Lastly, I believe the incidental expenses with regard to a suit will be far heavier in a District Court than in a Munsiff's Court. The process fees, the petitions fees, the execution fees and other fees will be far heavier in a District than in a Munsiff's Court, and the clients will be put to unnecessary expenditure. For these reasons, I think that it is not practicable to change the designation of the Devicolam Munsiff into "Sub-Judge". With these observations, I beg to move that the principle of the Bill be affirmed."

Mr. Subba Aiyar's motion was carried.

Mr. Subba Aiyar said that, as the Bill comprised but one Section, there was no need to refer it to a select Committee. He therefore moved that the operation of the ordinary rules of business be suspended, so that the Bill might go through all the stages except the final reading.

Seconded by Mr. Sesha Aiyar.

Carried.

Mr. Subba Aiyar then moved that the Bill be read again on a future day of which notice should be given.

Seconded by Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar.

Carried.

THE CHITTIES BILL.

Mr. Subba Aiyar next introduced the Chitties Bill, and spoke as follows :—

"SIR,

I beg to introduce a Bill to regulate chitties conducted in Travancore. The Bill has, with your permission, been duly published in the Government Gazette dated the 5th December 1916.

2. At a conference of District Judges and Munsiffs (both retired and in the service) held at the High Court, Trivandrum, on the 5th and the 12th Medom 1084 under the presidency of the late Mr. K. P. Sankara Menon, Puisne Judge of the High Court, for the consideration of the questions connected with the re-distribution of territorial jurisdiction of the several Courts necessitated by the Civil Courts Regulation, II of 1084, and the establishment of additional Courts to cope with the increasing litigation of the country, one of the subjects discussed was the necessity to devise some means by which a limit might be put to the number of Courts in this country. One of the conclusions arrived at by the conference was considered and approved by all the Honourable Judges of the High Court. Their views were accordingly communicated by the Registrar to the Chief Secretary to Government in his letter No. 1084,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly